

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. In an Office Action mailed August 22, 2006 ("OA"), the Examiner rejected claims 1-14 and 16-20, and objected to claim 15 but indicated that, if rewritten in independent form, it would be allowable. With this response, Applicants amend claims 1, 4, 7-9, and 16-18; and cancel claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 10-15, 19, and 20 without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections and request reconsideration based on the following remarks.

Applicants do not necessarily agree with or acquiesce in the Examiner's characterization of the claims or the prior art, even if those characterizations are not addressed herein.

Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to claim 1 because of a typographical error. In this response, Applicants amend claim 1 to correct the error.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejected claims 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In this response, Applicants cancel claims 19 and 20, thereby rendering this rejection moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw this rejection.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner objected to claim 15 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicated it would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

When reviewing the claims, Applicants noticed a typographical error. Claim 10 should depend from claim 6 instead of claim 4. Accordingly, Applicants amend claim 1 to include the elements of claim 15, along with the elements of intervening claims 2, 3, 6 [not 4], and 10-14. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, as amended, is patentable over the cited prior art.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, 16, and 17

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 16, and 17 as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,820,063 ("England") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,775,655 ("Peinado") and U.S. Patent No. 6,189,097 ("Tycksen"). Applicants cancel claim 2 and therefore this rejection is moot as to claim 2. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of remaining claims 1, 16, and 17.

As noted above, Applicants amend claim 1 to include the elements of claim 15 and its intervening claims. As noted above, the prior art fails to disclose this combination of elements. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over the cited prior art.

Claims 16 and 17 depend on claim 1 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 3

The Examiner rejected claim 3 as being obvious over England in view of Peinado and Tycksen, further in view of "SDMI Portable Device Specification, Part 1, Version 1.0" ("SDMI"). In this response, Applicants hereby cancel claim 3, thus rendering this rejection moot, and respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw this rejection.

Claims 4 and 5

The Examiner rejected claims 4 and 5 as being obvious over England in view of Peinado and Tycksen, further in view of SDMI and U.S. Patent No. 6,662,365 ("Sullivan"). In this response, Applicants hereby cancel claim 5, thus rendering the rejection of that claim moot. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection of remaining claim 4.

Claim 4 depends on claim 1. As noted above, Applicants have amended claim 1 to include the elements of claim 15 and its intervening claims. As noted above, the prior art fails to disclose this combination of elements. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over the cited prior art. Because claim 4 depends on claim 1, claim 4 is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims 6-8

The Examiner rejected claims 6-8 as being obvious over England in view of Peinado and Tycksen, further in view of SDMI and U.S. Patent No. 6,330,491 ("Lion").

In this response, Applicants hereby cancel claim 6, thus rendering the rejection of that claim moot. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of remaining claims 7 and 8.

Claims 7 and 8 depend on claim 1. As noted above, Applicants have amended claim 1 to include the elements of claim 15 and its intervening claims. As noted above, the prior art fails to disclose this combination of elements. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over the cited prior art. Because claims 7 and 8 depend on claim 1, claims 7 and 8 are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 9

The Examiner rejected claim 9 as being obvious over England in view of Peinado and Tycksen, further in view of SDMI, Lion, and U.S. Patent No. 5,982,898 ("Hsu"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 9 depends on claim 1. As noted above, Applicants have amended claim 1 to include the elements of claim 15 and its intervening claims. As noted above, the prior art fails to disclose this combination of elements. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over the cited prior art. Because claim 9 depends on claim 1, claim 9 is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims 10-14

The Examiner rejected claims 10-14 as being obvious over England in view of Peinado and Tycksen, further in view of Sullivan, SDMI, Lion, and Hsu. In this

response, Applicants cancel claims 10-14, thereby rendering this rejection moot.

Applicants thus respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw this rejection.

Claim 18

The Examiner rejected claim 18 as being obvious over England in view of Peinado and Tycksen, further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,920,861 ("Hall"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 18 depends on claim 1. As noted above, Applicants have amended claim 1 to include the elements of claim 15 and its intervening claims. As noted above, the prior art fails to disclose this combination of elements. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable over the cited prior art. Because claim 18 depends on claim 1, claim 18 is allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 19

The Examiner rejected claim 19 as being obvious over Peinado in view of England. In this response, Applicants cancel claim 19, thereby rendering this rejection moot. Applicants thus respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw this rejection.

Claim 20

The Examiner rejected claim 19 as being obvious over Peinado in view of England and SDMI. In this response, Applicants cancel claim 20, thereby rendering this rejection moot. Applicants thus respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw this rejection.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of this application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: December 22, 2006

By: 

Aaron J. Capron
Reg. No. 56,170
Direct (650) 849-6680

Filed Via - EFS WEB